



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/774,141      | 01/30/2001  | Magnus Hollstrom     | 34650-672PT         | 9924             |

7590 07/12/2005

Richard J. Moura, Esq.  
Jenkins & Gilchrist, P.C.  
Suite 3200  
1445 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, TX 75202-2799

| EXAMINER |
|----------|
|----------|

NGUYEN, JENNIFER T

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2674

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/774,141

**Applicant(s)**

HOLLSTROM ET AL.

**Examiner**

Jennifer T. Nguyen

**Art Unit**

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/9/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to amendment filed on 04/26/05.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-13, 15-16, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dymetman et al. (Patent No. US 6,330,976).

Regarding claims 1 and 15, referring to Figs. 1, 2, 6A, 8, and 9, Dymetman teaches an electronic reading device system, comprising:

an electronic reading device (502) for use with a formatted surface (2) having an address pattern thereon, the electronic reading device (502) including a sensor (i.e., camera 802) (Fig. 8) for detecting portions of the address pattern; wherein positions of the electronic reading device (502) relative to the on a formatted surface (2) are determined based on the detected portions of the address pattern (col. 8, lines 41-67); and

a separate electronic device (4) that includes a display screen for displaying feedback relating to the detected portions of address pattern, wherein at least a portion of the address pattern (2) identifies a specific application (col. 9, lines 1-5, col. 23, line 52 to col. 24, line 12); and

wherein the separate electronic device (4) is adapted to request an application description corresponding to the specific application from an application server (digital page), and retrieve the application description corresponding to the specific application from the application server (col. 25, lines 22-36).

Regarding claim 2, Dymetman further teaches the detected portions of the address pattern (2) correspond to information written using the electronic reading device (502) on the formatted surface, said feedback comprising a representation of the information written using the electronic reading device (502) (from col. 30, line 65 to col. 31, line 39).

Regarding claims 3, 4, and 21, Dymetman further teaches the written information comprises handwritten text, said representation comprising text characters that correspond to the handwritten text (col. 24, lines 20-65).

Regarding claims 5 and 19, Dymetman further teaches the formatted surface includes an area for requesting a display of feedback, said feedback displayed in response to a detection, by the electronic reading device (10), of a portion of the address pattern within said area (col. 29, line 1 to col. 30, line 7 and col. 35, lines 1-19).

Regarding claims 6, 7, and 20, Dymetman also teaches that a communication link between the electronic reading device (502) and the separate electronic device (4) (col. 8, lines 41-67).

Regarding claims 8, 13 and 16, Dymetman further teaches the formatted surface comprises an application interface corresponding to a specific application, said feedback displayed on the display screen comprising information relating to the specific application (col. 29, line 1 to col. 30, line 7 and col. 35, lines 1-19).

Art Unit: 2674

Regarding claims 9 and 10, Dymetman further teaches an application server from which the information relating to the specific application is retrieved via an Internet connection (col. 29, line 1 to col. 30, line 7 and col. 35, lines 1-19).

Regarding claim 11, Dymetman further teaches the information relating to the specific application comprises data previously stored by a user of the electronic reading device (col. 21, lines 28-58).

Regarding claims 12 and 18, Dymetman further teaches the separate electronic device is a personal computer (col. 24, lines 20-41).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Dymetman et al. (Patent No. US 6,330,976).

Regarding claims 14 and 17, Dymetman differs from claims 14 and 17 in that he does not specifically teach the feedback comprises help data for the specific application. However, Dymetman teaches the feedback comprises many different information needs (i.e., French gloss, map, product catalogues) for the specific application (col. 23, lines 1-9 and col. 35, lines 1-19). Therefore it would have been obvious to obtain the feedback comprises help information in order to provide a friendly user interface for users.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicants' arguments filed 04/26/05, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because as follows:

In response to Applicants' argument filed "there is no teaching or suggestion that the display 4 of Dymetman is adapted to request an application description corresponding to a specific application from an application server, and retrieve the application description corresponding to the specific application from the application server.", examiner respectfully disagrees. Dymetman teaches pointer (502) detects a region on the document (2) wherein each of the region identifies a specific application or request (col. 23, lines 53-55). The peripheral (4) is adapted to display feedback relate to the detected region of the document and establish a connection with the digital page (6) (i.e., web server or network) (col. 9, lines 64-67, col. 25, lines 3-7). The digital page (6) executes an action upon information related to the specific application and display output to the peripheral (4) (col. 25, lines 22-37). Therefore, it is believed that the ground of the rejection is maintained.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2674

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7696.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick N. Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer Nguyen  
7/6/05

  
REGINA LIANG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER